

2005-2006 Statewide Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services in

Indiana

Prepared by:



Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
OVERVIEW	6
PARTICIPATION	6
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	7
ONSITE MONITORING AND SITE VISIT REPORTS	9
DISTRICT SURVEY	9
PARENT SURVEY	10
PRINCIPAL SURVEY	11
ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS	11
2005-2006 EVALUATION RESULTS	13
ENROLLMENT TRENDS	13
OVERALL GRADES	14
PARENT SURVEY RESULTS	14
DISTRICT SURVEY RESULTS	15
PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS	16
SITE VISIT REPORTS	16
PROVIDER ASSESSMENT DATA AND GOAL ATTAINMENT	17
ISTEP+ ANALYSIS (SES STUDENTS ONLY)	17
ISTEP+ MATCHED PAIRS ANALYSIS	18
MATHEMATICS	19
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS	20
FUTURE DIRECTIONS	22
APPENDIX A	24

Executive Summary

According to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and that have not made adequate yearly progress (as measured by state standardized tests) for three consecutive years are required to offer Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch. States are required to approve SES providers and also to monitor and evaluate these providers. Indiana began its evaluation process in 2003-2004, and each year since has conducted and posted individual provider evaluations on its Indiana Department of Education SES Website. Providers are evaluated in the areas of customer satisfaction (using district, principal, and parent surveys); service delivery (using district, principal, and parent surveys, as well as state onsite monitoring reports); and academic effectiveness (using provider pre- and post-assessment data; attendance data; goal attainment data; and state standardized test, the ISTEP+, data). Providers are assigned letter grades based on a grading scale developed by the state. This paper details the comprehensive, statewide results of Indiana's 2005-2006 provider evaluations.

On average, 29 percent of those eligible for SES participated in services in 2005-2006. Slightly more students received tutoring services in Mathematics (3,786) than English/Language Arts or Reading (3,407). About 68 percent of students who signed up for SES completed their services. Results of parent surveys demonstrated that in general, parents were satisfied with the tutoring services that their children received. Most parents rated their child's provider as "good" or "excellent", and average responses to survey questions also ranged from "good" to "excellent". Additionally, when asked to rate providers' compliance with contractual and legal obligations, most school districts indicated that providers had done a satisfactory job. In contrast, school principals who completed surveys tended to rate providers lower than parents and districts, with responses generally rating providers as "average". Survey respondents on all types of surveys tended to give providers the lowest marks in progress reporting, indicating that often, providers did not adhere to agreed timetables for progress reporting or did not report progress to parents, teachers, or schools in a timely or understandable manner. State onsite reviews of providers in 2005-2006 generally indicated that providers' services were satisfactory in terms of offering tutoring that reflected the program described in the provider's original application to the state. Onsite visits indicated that while most providers received satisfactory marks, providers who received unsatisfactory ratings tended to receive them in the areas of student time on task (meaning that students were not focused on the lesson or that tutors were not successful at redirecting students who had fallen off task). Similar to survey ratings, providers who received unsatisfactory ratings in the document analysis portion of the onsite review (in which state officials review lesson plans, recruiting materials, tutor qualifications, and progress reports, including progress reporting timelines) tended to receive them in the area of progress reporting, either because progress reports were not easily understood or progress reports were not being sent according to the timeline described in the provider's original application to the state.

As for academic effectiveness, the majority of students participating in SES showed progress on providers' pre- and post-assessments (all providers are required to administer a pre-assessment, upon which the student's individualized program is then based, and the same test as a post-assessment to measure student progress). About 84 percent of students met the goals that were set for them in English/Language Arts by the SES provider (goals are also approved by parents and school district officials), and 87 percent of students met Mathematics goals.

Providers were also assessed on their effectiveness at increasing participating students' scores on the state's ISTEP+ assessment. ISTEP+ scores in Mathematics and English/Language Arts (as applicable, depending upon which subjects students were tutored in) from the fall of 2005 were used as baseline scores. ISTEP+ scores from the fall of 2006 were used as "growth" scores. Only students who completed 80 percent of their tutoring sessions and had ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in the ISTEP+ analysis. Overall, 68 percent of participating students showed any growth in their ISTEP+ scores in English/Language Arts, compared to 67 percent showing growth in Mathematics scores. 46 percent of students showed the equivalent of one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ Mathematics and English/Language Arts.

In English/Language Arts, participating students showed an average gain of 15 points on the ISTEP+ assessment, not the equivalent of one year's worth of growth. In Mathematics, participating students showed an average gain of 19 points on the ISTEP+ assessment, also not the equivalent of one year's growth on the test. As noted below, these results should be looked at as informational only, as the analysis does not include a matched group.

For a more rigorous analysis of the effects of SES tutoring, participating students were matched with non-participating students on a number of variables, including school, grade, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficient status, ethnicity, and 2005 ISTEP+ score (within 25 points). Overall, 47 percent of the SES participating students (for whom matches were available) showed the equivalent of one year's growth on ISTEP+ Mathematics, compared to a slightly lower percentage (43 percent) of the non-participating students. In English/Language Arts, about the same percentage of matched SES students as non-participating students showed one year's growth (47 percent for the SES group compared to 46 percent for the non-SES group). Matched pairs were analyzed using analysis of covariance to further control for 2005 ISTEP+ score. ANCOVA was conducted for each provider having 15 or more students in its SES and non-SES group ($n = 12$ for Mathematics, $n = 13$ for English/Language Arts). Additionally, ANCOVA was conducted by school district, for each district having 15 or more students in each group ($n = 7$). Using ANCOVA by provider, there was no provider whose participating students showed gains that differed significantly ($p < .05$) from the non-SES group. There were also no school districts whose SES students made gains that were statistically significantly different from their matched non-participating counterparts.

When holding 2005 ISTEP+ score constant, the average ISTEP+ Mathematics gain for the SES group was 1.8 points higher than the non-SES group (not significant at $p < .05$). In contrast, the non-SES group outgained the matched SES group by 1.1 points in English/Language Arts (not significant at $p < .05$). SES students served by nine of twelve providers demonstrated ISTEP+ gains that were higher than the non-SES students' gains in Mathematics, compared to six of thirteen in English/Language Arts. Again, differences were not significant at $p < .05$.

ANCOVA results must be interpreted with caution. First, despite the fact that students were able to be matched on a number of demographic characteristics, including school and grade, data limitations prohibited matching students by teacher. Thus, teacher effects are not controlled for in this analysis. In addition, due to data limitations, it is not possible to control for other programs that SES students (or their non-SES matched counterparts) participated in throughout the school year. Therefore, any gains made by SES students, or differences in gains between the two groups, cannot necessarily be solely attributable to the SES program. Moreover, data were only available for one year. Given that most SES programs operate for

approximately thirty to fifty hours, it is perhaps impractical to assume that there would be large differences in growth between SES and non-SES groups. Analyses that look at growth differences over time, for those students who have participated in SES for multiple years (and potentially with the same provider) as compared to students who have never participated in SES may be more powerful at determining the actual effects of SES on student achievement.

The Indiana Department of Education is currently conducting its 2006-2007 evaluation of SES providers. For that evaluation, providers will again be evaluated on aggregated, statewide results; however, provider data will also be disaggregated at the district level to address any issues that may be specific to a particular school district. The Department has also developed a tutoring resource guide for providers that offers tips on increasing communication between providers, parents, and school districts, as well as research-based strategies for increasing student achievement in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. Finally, the Department will also begin looking at characteristics of effective SES providers and will begin to analyze SES student achievement longitudinally by looking at the academic growth of students who have participated in SES for two years.

Individual provider evaluations can be accessed on the Indiana Department of Education's Supplemental Educational Services Website, <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/Evaluations.cfm>. Onsite monitoring reports are also available for each provider for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years.

Overview

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) is a program of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. Under NCLB, Title I, Part A, schools receiving Title I funds are required to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in reducing achievement gaps and ensuring that all students are able to meet rigorous state academic standards. In order to demonstrate that all schools are accountable for all students, school districts and buildings must disaggregate results for subpopulations of students, including minority groups, free and reduced price lunch eligible students, and special education students. Title I schools that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years are required to offer families the ability to transfer to a school in the district (or outside of the district, if no schools are available) that has not been identified as in need of improvement. If the school fails to make AYP for a third consecutive year, it is required to offer SES.

Districts that have Title I schools in improvement must set aside an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A funds for SES and choice-related transportation services. SES tutoring providers are selected by states using objective criteria through an application process (Indiana's application process is described on its SES Website at <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/provider-application.html>). Once placed on the state-approved SES list, providers may offer services to any low-income (free or reduced price lunch eligible) students attending schools in Year Two and higher of improvement. Parents are able to select any provider that has agreed to offer services for their child's school and that they feel is the best fit for their child. Districts are required to enter into contracts with providers and sign goal agreements between parents, districts, and providers. Moreover, districts must pay providers for services through their 20 percent set-aside. Based on the district's total Title I allocation and census poverty count, a per-pupil expenditure for each district is tallied. Per-pupil expenditures for SES in Indiana generally range from about \$850 to \$1,900.

Participation

In the 2005-2006 school year, 23 school corporations had schools that were required to offer SES. 50 schools were required to offer SES (this includes schools that were in Year Two or higher of improvement and schools that had restructured under NCLB but were still required to offer SES until they had made AYP for two consecutive years).

40 schools in eighteen school districts had parents who chose to participate in SES. In general, urban and suburban districts were more likely to have students participating in SES than rural districts. The overall participation rate for SES in 2005-2006 was 29 percent (calculated as the total number of students participating, as reported by school districts on their Title I annual reports, divided by the total number of eligible students—those in each school who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch). Participation rates ranged from a low of 0 percent (four rural districts) to a high of approximately 62 percent (Indianapolis Public Schools). A number of other urban and suburban districts also had participation rates that exceeded the state average, including MSD of Perry Township (Indianapolis, approx. 32 percent), Community Schools of Frankfort (approx. 40 percent), Marion Community Schools (approx. 43 percent), MSD of Lawrence Township (Indianapolis, approx. 50 percent), and East Allen County Schools (Ft. Wayne, approx. 55 percent).

As noted, the United States Department of Education (USDOE) officially calculates the participation rate for SES as the number of participating students divided by the total number of free and reduced lunch eligible students in the school. However, because a school district is only required to set aside 20 percent of its Title I dollars, a more accurate method of calculating participation rate is to determine the number of students in a district that could possibly be served by the district's 20 percent set-aside, and then divide the number of students participating by that calculation. In fact, as per USDOE non-regulatory guidance, a district is not intended to spend more than 20 percent of its Title I, Part A dollars on choice and SES. If a district has more students sign up for SES than it can serve with its 20 percent set-aside, it is required to give priority to its lowest achieving students and must create a fair and equitable process for determining achievement levels. Because a district is neither required, nor even permitted to use more than its 20 percent set-aside for SES, participation rates that depend upon total numbers of eligible students may create artificially deflated participation rates. Especially for a small district that has a set-aside amount of \$200,000 or less, or a large district that has a large number of free and reduced lunch eligible students, it may be impossible ever to reach 100 percent participation, even though the maximum numbers of students that can be funded through the set-aside are participating. The examples below illustrate this point.

Adjusted participation rate information was not calculated until the 2006-2007 school year and therefore is unavailable for the 2005-2006 school year. For informational purposes (and to demonstrate the differences in the USDOE calculation and the adjusted calculation), Indianapolis Public Schools' 2006-2007 data may be used as a comparison. To illustrate, preliminary reports (submitted in January of 2007) note that 5,033 students were eligible to participate in SES (meaning IPS had 5,033 free and reduced price lunch eligible students in SES schools in 2006-2007). However, if IPS were to use 100 percent of its 20 percent set-aside (though this is not required, as districts may split the 20 percent between choice-related transportation and SES), it would only be able to serve 3,568 students during the year. Thus, using the USDOE participation rate calculation, even if it had 3,568 students participating, it would not have reached 100 percent participation, despite the fact that it would not be permitted to serve more than the 3,568 students. In January of 2007, IPS had 2,417 students participating in SES (these numbers have likely increased, but final reports have not yet been submitted for the 2006-2007 school year). Using the USDOE participation rate calculation, the official participation rate at IPS would be 48 percent ($2,417 / 5,033$). However, if one acknowledges that there is not a possibility that IPS could have served 5,033 students and instead uses the adjusted participation rate ($2,417 / 3,568$ —the number of students that could possibly be served by the 20 percent set-aside), IPS's rate grows to 68 percent. MSD of Decatur Township is another illustrative example of the difference that occurs when one examines the total number of students eligible to receive services versus the total number of students that could possibly be served by the district. In 2006-2007, Decatur's official participation rate was thirteen percent (73 students participating / 562 total free and reduced lunch eligible students in Decatur SES schools). However, using its 20 percent set-aside, it would only have been possible for Decatur to serve 89 students. With 73 of the 89 possible participating, Decatur's participation rate rises to 82 percent.

Evaluation Methodology

Indiana has evaluated providers since the 2003-2004 school year using a grading system (A-F).

Indiana's evaluation attempts to answer three questions:

- 1). How well are providers implementing services, and to what extent are providers implementing their programs with fidelity to their originally approved application?
- 2). How satisfied are constituents (districts, schools, and parents) with the services that providers are offering?
- 3). Are providers increasing the academic achievement of the students that they are serving?

To answer these questions, providers are evaluated in three categories: service delivery, customer satisfaction, and academic effectiveness. Indiana Department of Education SES staff collects and analyzes data in each area. Service delivery components include an on-site monitoring visit to each and every provider, document analysis, including review of teacher qualifications, lesson plans, and health and safety procedures, as well as parent surveys, district surveys, and principal surveys. Based on all components, providers are given a letter grade (A-F), using the standard 4.0-0.0 grading scale.

Customer satisfaction includes questions on district surveys, parent surveys, and principal surveys. Again, based on all components, providers are given a letter grade (A-F). Academic effectiveness includes provider pre- and post-assessment data, the number of students meeting predetermined goals, and attendance and completion data. As of the 2004-2005 school year, Indiana began a pilot project using Indiana's statewide assessment (ISTEP+) test score data to be included in provider evaluations. Since the 2005-2006 school year, a provider's academic effectiveness grade has included evidence of the percentage of students showing growth on ISTEP+ scale score, the percentage of students showing the equivalent of one year's growth on ISTEP+ scale score, and the change in the percentage of students passing ISTEP+ from one year to the next (using just the SES students). In addition, the SES group is compared to a related non-SES group to determine which group had greater percentages of students showing any growth, one year's growth, and passing ISTEP+ in 2006. Based on all components (ISTEP+, attendance, pre- and post-assessment results, and the percentage of students meeting SES agreement goals) providers are given a letter grade (A-F). For research purposes, an ANCOVA analysis is run statewide and for each district using ISTEP+ results.

Evaluation reports are sent to each SES district and are posted on the Indiana Department of Education SES Website at <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/Evaluations.cfm>. Methodology for data collection and analysis for each section of the evaluation is described later in this report.

Letter grades from each category are combined to form an overall grade. Providers are expected to perform well in each category in order to receive a grade of A or B. Providers receiving a C or below (in any category or overall) are required to submit a corrective action plan to address deficiencies. The corrective action plan may be shared with districts and the general public, as appropriate. As of the 2006-2007 school year, any provider receiving a C or below in any category for three consecutive years is required to reapply, regardless of where that provider is in the reapplication cycle (all providers will be required to reapply every five years, as of the 2006-2007 school year). In addition, providers receiving a D or F in any category or overall are placed on probation for the following year and must submit a corrective action plan before providing SES services during the following school year. As of the 2006-2007 school year, providers receiving a D or F in any category or overall for two consecutive years are removed

from the state-approved provider list. These providers may re-apply for state approval one year following removal from the list.

Onsite Monitoring and Site Visit Reports

Onsite monitoring reports are broken into three sections—document analysis, site visit report, and compliance. For the document analysis component, each provider is required to submit evidence of tutor qualifications, academic programming, connections to Indiana academic standards, and progress reporting. Documents are submitted to and reviewed by one monitor who analyzes the documentation to determine whether the program is being implemented with fidelity to the description provided in the provider’s original, approved application. For each section, providers are rated “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”. Based on ratings assigned, a provider is given a letter grade.

Site visits were conducted to each provider at various locations. For increased reliability of reporting, two monitors are present at each site (except in the case of online providers). To the extent feasible, monitors observe more than one tutoring session. During the onsite monitoring visits, monitors determine the level to which the instruction that is viewed matches the description that was given in the provider’s original, approved application. Additionally, the reviewers look to see how knowledgeable the instructors are with regards to the provider’s programming and curriculum, as well as the academic needs of each child. The reviewers also look at the amount of time spent on task, the clarity of instruction given, and the overall student/instructor ratio. The observed ratio must at least match the ratio given in the provider’s original, approved application. Ratio may be lower than that described in the application, but it may not exceed the description. After the review has been completed, the monitors compare ratings for inter-rater reliability and compile a final report. Based on the final report, a provider is given a letter grade.

The Compliance section of the Site Visit Report deals with criminal background checks, student health and safety, and financial viability. Providers are required to submit evidence that criminal background checks are properly completed. In addition, providers are required to submit evidence that health and safety laws and regulations are followed, as well as to submit policies related to transportation, student release, and emergency evacuation. Finally, providers must submit evidence of financial viability, such as business licenses, liability insurance, tax returns, or financial audits. This documentation is reviewed, and a grade is given.

Providers are given one week to review the overall report after it has been completed. If a provider disagrees with a rating, the provider must offer substantiated evidence as to why the rating is incorrect. If substantiated evidence is not produced, the rating will not be changed. Letter grades assigned for the Document Analysis, Onsite Visit, and Compliance portions are averaged into an overall Site Visit Report grade. This grade is included in the provider’s Service Delivery grade as part of the provider evaluation. Please note—Department staff conduct onsite visits to each provider every year; however, providers are only required to submit documentation for the Document Analysis and Compliance portions in their first year as an active provider, and every two years thereafter.

District Survey

Each SES district is asked to complete an online survey that consists of ten questions. In

addition, each district is asked to report the number of students who signed up for SES services, the number of students who signed up for SES who have special education needs, and the number of students who signed up for SES who are limited English proficient. These data are collected from the district to help verify numbers submitted by each SES provider.

Each district is asked whether it would recommend that the state continue its approval of that SES provider (yes or no). Additionally, the district must answer nine questions related to fulfillment of contractual obligations. For each question, the district rates the provider as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” (one question allows the district to opt for “don’t know”, and another question allows the district to select “not applicable”). If a district rates a provider as unsatisfactory for any particular question, the district is asked to provide comments and evidence to substantiate the unsatisfactory rating.

Results are compiled for each provider and then, as applicable, are aggregated across districts for providers that served more than one district. The overall percentage of districts recommending or not recommending a provider is calculated, and based on this calculation, providers are assigned a letter grade that is included in the Customer Satisfaction section of the provider evaluation report. In addition, responses to the nine questions related to fulfillment of contractual obligations are converted into an overall score for the provider, which is translated into a letter grade. This grade is included in the Service Delivery portion of the provider evaluation.

In 2005-2006, 100 percent of active districts responded to the district survey. However, in the case of two providers that were also the school district (MSD of Lawrence Township and Community Schools of Frankfort acted as SES providers), the school district survey results were not used to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

Parent Survey

Each active provider was sent surveys to distribute to parents in the spring of 2006. Parents were instructed to answer each question on the survey, and then to place the survey in a sealed envelope and return it to their child’s tutoring provider. Providers then returned the surveys to the Department of Education. Parents answered each question using a four-point Likert scale. A response of strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. Each response was converted to the appropriate point value; point values were then converted into a letter grade. Questions 1, 2, 5, and 6 on the survey were calculated as a point value, which was then converted into a letter grade. This grade was used as part of the overall grade for the Customer Satisfaction section of the provider evaluation. Questions 3 and 4 were also calculated as a point value and converted into a letter grade; however, that grade was used as a portion of the Service Delivery grade on the provider evaluation.

In the past, surveys had been sent to school districts to distribute to parents. However, extremely low response rates led Department staff to examine new ways of distributing parent surveys for the 2005-2006 school year. By distributing surveys to providers, the response rate more than quadrupled, going from eight percent in 2004-2005 to 33 percent in 2005-2006. As a result, the Department has continued to use this method for survey distribution into the 2006-2007 school year and beyond. A total of 882 parents from thirteen of eighteen active districts responded to the survey. Response rates for each provider ranged from a low of ten percent to a high of 100 percent. The median response rate was 50 percent.

Principal Survey

Each principal in an SES school was asked to respond to a survey that contained questions about the services delivered by each SES provider who served that school. The survey consisted of eight questions. Using a five-point Likert scale, principals were asked to answer each question. Responses were then converted into points. A response of strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. A response of “don’t know” was converted into a null value and was not included in the overall scoring average. Questions 1, 5, 7, and 8 on the principal survey were calculated as a point value, which was then converted into a letter grade. This grade was used as part of the overall grade for the Customer Satisfaction section of the provider evaluation. Questions 2, 3, 4, and 6 were also calculated as a point value and converted into a letter grade; however, that grade was used as a portion of the Service Delivery grade on the provider evaluation. 74 percent of principals in SES schools participated in the 2005-2006 survey.

Academic Effectiveness

Several types of data are included in the Academic Effectiveness section of the provider evaluation. At the end of each school year, data are collected from providers that detail the number of students who signed up, the number of students who completed services, and the number of students who attended 80 percent or more of their SES sessions. In addition, providers are required to submit data on the pre- and post-test scores for each student served. Finally, providers are required to submit a description of the assessment used as a pre- and post-test for their SES students.

Data are compiled into a report. Each provider is given a letter grade based attendance rate, the percentage of students who met their pre-determined SES goals, and the percentage of students who showed growth on the pre- and post-assessment used.

In addition to the data submitted by each provider, data were collected related to SES students’ performance on the ISTEP+ test, Indiana’s state standardized test. Because Indiana is a fall testing state, 2005 scores were used as a baseline for the 2005-2006 school year, and 2006 scores were used as growth scores. Students who had completed 80 percent of their SES sessions were included in this analysis. Students who were in grades K-2, which are untested grades, were excluded; additionally, students who did not have scores for both 2005 and 2006 and students who had been retained in the same grade or demoted were not included. Any student who appeared as a duplicate (as having been tutored by more than one provider) was also excluded. Finally, students who had moved out of state or were otherwise unable to be located in the state’s Student Test Number (STN) system were also excluded. Students’ ISTEP+ scores were analyzed in either English/Language Arts, Mathematics, or both, depending on which subjects the student had studied with their provider.

For each provider, SES students’ 2005 and 2006 performances on ISTEP+ were analyzed. In order to create a sample size as large as possible, student scores were aggregated across districts for providers who served more than one school district. SES students’ scale scores were analyzed to determine whether the students had made any growth on scale score from one year to the next. Additionally, student scores were analyzed to determine the number of students participating in SES who had shown the equivalent of one year’s growth on ISTEP+ scale score. One year’s growth was calculated by subtracting the cut score for one grade from

the cut score for the next highest grade (for example, the cut score for third grade Mathematics is 393, while the cut score for fourth grade Mathematics is 415. Thus, a student would need to grow 22 points in order to pass the test as a fourth grader. As such, growth of 22 points would be considered the equivalent of one year's worth). Finally, the percentage of SES students passing ISTEP+ in 2005 was compared against the percentage of those same students passing ISTEP+ in 2006. Where grades were disaggregated, mean scale score growth was analyzed to determine whether, using the description provided previously, growth was the equivalent of one year's worth (in other words, had students shown enough scale score growth to pass the test from one year to the next, regardless of whether they had actually passed the test in 2005). Mean ISTEP+ scale score growth was also examined across grades. Where grades were aggregated, an average of scale score point increases needed to show one year's growth from one grade to the next was taken to determine whether total mean growth equaled the equivalent of one year.

In addition to analyzing growth for SES students only, to the extent possible, each SES student was matched with a similar student from the same school who had not participated in SES. Students were matched on 2005 ISTEP+ score (within 25 points), school, grade, free and reduced price lunch eligibility, special education status, race, and limited English proficiency status. When a match was not possible, the SES student was not included in the matched analysis. For each matched pair, the same analysis was conducted as for the SES students only (percentage of students showing any growth, one year's worth of growth, and change in passing percentage from 2005 to 2006). Only providers who had matched groups of at least five or more students were included in the analysis.

Based on a provider's performance on this analysis, as well as the provider's performance with just the students who participated in SES, each provider was assigned a letter grade. The ISTEP+ grade counted for 30 percent of a provider's overall Academic Effectiveness grade, with 20 percent accounted for by attendance, 25 percent by growth on the provider's pre- and post-assessment, and 25 percent by the percentage of students meeting pre-determined SES goals.

In addition to the descriptive analysis described above, for informational purposes, an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted statewide and for each SES district. The purpose of this analysis was to determine, after further controlling for 2005 ISTEP+ score, whether the mean 2006 ISTEP+ score was statistically significantly higher for the SES group than the non-SES group (across the state and in each SES district). The analysis aggregated data from all providers for a particular district. This was done to maximize n size for the analysis, as many providers, when analyzed by themselves, would not have had n sizes sufficient to generate desired statistical power. In order to be included in the ANCOVA, a district must have had at least fifteen students in both the SES and non-SES groups (with a combined n of at least 30). Individual providers with n sizes of 30 or greater (15 in each group) were also analyzed with ANCOVA. For providers that served more than one district, data were aggregated across districts to increase sample size and statistical power. Data were not disaggregated by grade for these analyses due to small sample sizes.

It should be noted that results from this analysis should be interpreted with caution, due to a number of limitations. First, despite the fact that students were able to be matched on a number of demographic characteristics, including school and grade, data limitations prohibited matching students by teacher. Thus, teacher effects are not controlled for in this analysis. In addition, due to data limitations, it is not possible to control for other programs that SES students (or their non-SES matched counterparts) participated in throughout the school year. Therefore, any gains made by SES students, or differences in gains between the two groups, cannot

necessarily be solely attributed to the SES program. Moreover, data were available for only one year. Given that most SES programs operate for approximately thirty to fifty hours, it is perhaps impractical to assume that there would be large differences in growth between SES and non-SES groups. Analyses that look at growth differences over time, for those students who have participated in SES for multiple years (and potentially with the same provider) as compared to students who have never participated in SES may be more powerful at determining the actual effects of SES on student achievement.

2005-2006 Evaluation Results

Enrollment Trends

Overall, parents tended to select face-to-face tutors at a greater rate than online tutors. Interestingly, although online tutors might seem to be a viable option for parents in rural districts (especially for those who do not have a wide variety of providers to select from, or for whom transportation is an issue), it was parents from urban or suburban districts who were more likely to select this type of provider. Parents in rural districts tended to select in-home providers more commonly than online or off site providers. In addition, in districts that allowed SES providers to operate in school buildings, participation rates were higher. This is not surprising, given the convenience of not having to transport the child to another site after school. Additionally, a number of districts that did allow providers to operate in school buildings also offered transportation home after tutoring. In general, providers who offered transportation tended to have higher enrollments than providers who did not.

About three percent of the students who participated in SES in 2005-2006 were limited English proficient, and about 14 percent were students with special education needs. It should be noted these percentages are approximate and may be slightly deflated, as some school districts did not report these numbers as asked on the district survey. Slightly more students were tutored in Mathematics ($n = 3,786$) than in English/Language Arts (which includes Reading, Writing, Vocabulary, and Language, $n = 3,407$). However, most students were tutored in both subjects.

The overall completion rate (percentage of students who completed their SES sessions divided by the total percentage who signed up for services) statewide for English/Language Arts students was 68 percent. For students who participated in Mathematics, it was nearly the same, 69 percent. Completion rates for both subjects ranged from a high of 100 percent to a low of 0 percent. In total, about 69 percent of all SES students who signed up for SES attended 80 percent or more of their SES sessions. 80 percent attendance rates ranged from 0 to 100 percent. Completion rates by district ranged from a high of 100 percent to a low of 13 percent. For districts that had more than 150 students sign up, completion rates ranged from 50 percent to 83 percent. For these larger districts, MSD of Lawrence Township (83 percent) and Indianapolis Public Schools (76 percent) had the highest completion rates.

While some districts had only one provider, a number of districts had several providers. Not surprisingly, urban districts were more likely than rural districts to have multiple providers, as generally their selection of providers is larger. Indianapolis Public Schools, the largest school district in Indiana, had the most providers (14), followed closely by Gary Community School Corporation with 12. These two districts also had the most students signed up for SES. However, having more than one provider was not necessarily a requisite for having a large number students participate; to illustrate, Elkhart Community Schools had 113 students

participating, Community Schools of Frankfort (in which the district was the provider) had 132, and Marion Community Schools had 104. Table 1 (Appendix A) shows each SES district and the number and names of providers that served it.

Overall Grades

As noted in the methodology section above, each provider was given a grade for the categories of Customer Satisfaction, Service Delivery, and Academic Effectiveness. These grades were averaged to create an Overall Evaluation grade for each provider. Individual evaluation reports for each provider for both 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 can be found online at <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/Evaluations.cfm>.

In the 2005-2006 school year, generally, providers tended to receive higher grades in the customer satisfaction and service delivery components than in the academic effectiveness component. To illustrate, 74 percent of providers received between B+ and A on customer satisfaction. 82 percent received between B+ and A on service delivery, while 38 percent scored between B+ and A on academic effectiveness.

The average grade for customer satisfaction was a B+, while the average grade for service delivery was also a B+. However, the average grade for academic effectiveness was a B. 44 percent of providers received lower than a B (a B- to a D). In the service delivery section, providers tended to score lowest on the principal survey component, while they scored highest on the parent survey component. Similarly, providers scored highest in the parent survey component of customer satisfaction and lowest in the principal survey component. For academic effectiveness, providers tended to score lowest in the ISTEP+ section and highest in the percentage of students meeting goals as set out in the SES agreement component.

Parent Survey Results

On the whole, parents responding to the survey appeared to be relatively pleased with services. When asked how they would rate their child's tutoring provider overall (on a scale of one to four, with one being "poor" and four being "excellent"), on average, providers were rated a 3.6 (between "good" and "excellent"). Average scores for this question ranged from a low of 2.3 (between "average" and "good") to a high of 4.0 ("excellent"). Five providers received average scores of 4.0 on this question, and only one provider received an overall average score of less than 3.

Providers tended to score the lowest on question 4, which asked about progress reporting, with an average score of 3.27 out of 4 (see Table 2, Appendix A, for average scores on each question). Common positive comments included indications from parents that their children had improved in school as a result of the tutoring, that the children had enjoyed the tutoring, and that the tutors had been patient, professional, or helpful. Common negative comments included complaints that the tutoring sessions were too short, that there was a lack of communication or progress reporting, and that there were technical difficulties with computers or hardware shipped for use with the program (for online providers).

District Survey Results

There are two components of the district survey that are used for the provider evaluation: whether the district would recommend the provider (yes or no), and satisfactory/unsatisfactory answers to nine contractual questions. Somewhat obviously, districts tend to respond to each component in a similar manner (i.e., districts that are likely to select “satisfactory” for the majority of the contractual questions are also likely to indicate that they would recommend the provider).

Overall, districts were more likely to recommend a provider’s continuation (n = 55 yes responses) than not (n = seven no responses). The most common reasons given for non-recommendation were problems getting parents hardware needed to participate in the program and lack of follow-up with parents when there were problems with the hardware (for online providers), as well as lack of communication with the district and parents. In addition, some districts complained that providers were very late in starting services because of a lack of available tutors, sometimes leaving parents without services for a number of months.

On the nine contractual questions, districts must respond with “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” to all but two questions. On question six, which asks whether providers fulfilled contractual obligations to serve students with limited English proficiency or students with special needs, districts are given the option of answering “not applicable”. This option is provided because, according to federal rule and guidance, SES providers are not required to serve these students. As such, providers who did not indicate that they would serve these students are given a “not applicable”. In addition, on question five (which asks whether the provider’s program matched programs and curriculum provided in the district), districts are given the option of answering “don’t know.” This is the only question for which districts can provide a “don’t know” answer. This option is provided because a number of districts have expressed that while it is practical for them to answer all other contractually related questions on the survey, given the fact that districts are not required to monitor (on-site) the services of providers, many are not aware if the services rendered are actually matching the programs of the district. Although they are given this option, out of 62 responses provided, only ten responses to question five were “don’t know”.

Provider scores on the nine-question survey ranged from a high of 100 percent satisfactory responses to a low of 38 percent satisfactory responses. Providers were most likely to receive satisfactory responses to question seven, a procedural question related to maintaining confidentiality, and questions five and six, (when those questions were answered). Providers were more likely to receive unsatisfactory responses to question four than any other question. Table 3 (Appendix A) shows average responses to each question on the survey (a “satisfactory” response was coded as 2, while an “unsatisfactory” response was coded as 0).

While districts were generally satisfied that providers were fulfilling contractual obligations, the most typical concerns expressed related to a lack of communication with the district, lack of submission of academic data and progress reports, and that progress reports were unclear or confusing. Additionally, some districts complained of large time lags between providers being given parent contact information and tutoring actually starting. Positive comments offered by districts included high levels of satisfaction with some providers communication with the district, as well as positive efforts from providers to communicate with parents and the community.

Principal Survey Results

For each question, principals were asked to respond whether they agreed or disagreed using a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). On each question, principals were also given the option of answering “don’t know”. “Don’t know” responses were given a null value and were not included in the overall scoring analysis. Principals were most likely to answer “don’t know” to Question 5 (n = 37 “don’t know” responses out of 88 total responses), which related to parent satisfaction with SES. A number of principals indicated that they had not heard anything from parents, and that therefore they did not feel comfortable answering that question. Question 7 (related to academic improvement) also had a lot of “don’t know” answers (n = 31), as principals indicated that they either felt it was too early to determine, or they could not distinguish achievement that was a direct result of SES.

Providers scored highest on Question 2 (3.23), which was a primarily procedural question related to whether services interfered with the regular school day. Providers scored lowest on Question 4 (2.14), which asked about communication and progress reporting. Providers also scored fairly low on Question 7 (2.25, from those principals who did not respond with “don’t know”) and Question 8, which rated the overall satisfaction with the provider (2.22, with 1 being poor and 4 being excellent). Table 4 (Appendix A) provides results for each question. As noted, responses of “don’t know” were given a null value and are not included in the overall scoring.

Of the three groups surveyed (principals, parents, and districts), principals were the most likely to give negative responses (disagree or strongly disagree) on surveys. The most common area of principal concern was lack of communication with parents and the school. Many principals expressed frustration that once an initial meeting had been conducted with a provider, no additional notices or progress reports were sent and communication virtually ceased. On the other hand, some principals expressed high levels of satisfaction with provider communication; others were pleased that providers had hired certified teachers from the school, which appeared to improve communication. After speaking with principals, district staff, and providers, it seemed in some cases that there were communication blockages. For example, in some districts, providers are required to communicate only with district staff. Providers expressed frustration that often, they did not feel that informational reports that they provided were being shared with school-level staff. Moreover, some providers felt that district staff had not appropriately trained principals and school personnel on effective SES implementation. However, some district staff and principals felt that regardless of district communication policies, some providers did not make enough of an effort to ensure that services started on time and that the lines of communication were open.

Site Visit Reports

Results of the document analysis component indicate that in general, providers’ on-site services were comparable to descriptions that were approved in their original provider applications. As such, providers were most likely to receive “satisfactory” marks for the academic programming component of the onsite report. Additionally, the majority of providers received satisfactory reports for the recruiting materials section, which examines whether recruiting materials reflect the provider’s program and are in line with Indiana Department of Education incentive and recruiting policies. Of the four categories in the document analysis component, providers were most likely to receive unsatisfactory marks in the progress reporting section. This was because a number of providers were not adhering to timetables for progress reporting that were described in the original application.

In the onsite visit component, providers were most likely to receive satisfactory ratings in the second, fourth, and fifth categories (clarity of instruction, appropriately knowledgeable instructors, and student/instructor ratio). Though providers were most likely to receive unsatisfactory ratings in the third category (student time on task), in general, the majority of providers received satisfactory ratings in all categories in the onsite visit component. In the compliance section, all providers received satisfactory ratings in the second and third categories (compliance with health and safety laws and regulations and financial viability). However, a number of providers received unsatisfactory ratings in the criminal background check section. In all cases, the rating was not a result of the provider's not completing background checks; instead, it was generally a result of the provider's not complying with Indiana Department of Education rules and regulations for background checks. Some providers had background checks completed on tutors after they had already begun working with students. Additionally, some providers violated rules and regulations by allowing employees to submit checks to them, instead of conducting the checks themselves. Table 5 (Appendix A) describes the percentages of satisfactory and unsatisfactory ratings received for each category.

Provider Assessment Data and Goal Attainment

For the purpose of assigning letter grades for the provider evaluation, data were aggregated across all districts served by a provider. Most providers (71 percent) served only one district. 21 percent of providers served two or three districts, and only 9 percent served more than three districts. Because all providers are required to administer a pre- and post-assessment to diagnose student's learning levels and measure student growth, the percentage of students showing gains on the providers' assessments is included in the overall evaluation. The vast majority (95% in Mathematics and 90% in English/Language Arts) of students showed growth on provider pre- and post-assessments. Additionally, for each student served, SES providers are required to meet with parents and set individualized learning goals for students. District officials are also required to sign off on the goals. Providers are assessed on the percentage of students who met those goals. Overall, 84 percent of students met goals in English/Language Arts, and 87 percent of students met goals in Mathematics. By district, percentage meeting goals (for both subjects) ranged from 54 percent to 100 percent. Four districts (of 17) had percentages less than 70, while 8 districts had percentages greater than 90. For districts that had over 150 students participating, percentages ranged from 54 percent to 93 percent.

ISTEP+ Analysis Results (SES students only)

For the first time in 2005-2006, ISTEP+ results were included in the academic effectiveness grades of SES providers. As noted, ISTEP+ scores were included only for students who had completed 80 percent of their SES sessions and who had ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006. Because not all students participated in both English and Math tutoring sessions, each subject was analyzed separately.

Results are reported statewide and by provider. Data are not reported for providers who had sample sizes of less than 15 to protect confidentiality. Tables 6 and 7 (Appendix A) show results by district for students participating in English/Language Arts and Mathematics tutoring, respectively. The analyses reported in Tables 6 and 7 represent only students who participated in SES (they are not being compared to a similar non-SES sample). The information reported in

this section should be used for informational purposes only (and results should be interpreted with extreme caution), due to a number of limitations.

In terms of percentages showing growth, students performed about the same in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. Overall 68 percent of SES students made any growth on ISTEP+ English/Language Arts, compared to 67 percent in Math. 46 percent showed the equivalent of one year's growth in English/Language Arts and Math. SES students in two grades (4 and 5) showed mean growth that was the equivalent of one year in both English/Language Arts and Math; however, mean growth in none of the other grades equaled the equivalent of one year. Students in Grade 5 showed the greatest mean growth in both subjects. Students in that grade also had the largest percentages of students showing any growth on ISTEP+ in both subjects and showing the equivalent of one year's worth of growth.

Results reported in this section should be interpreted with caution. Examining the mean growth of SES students only does not take into consideration the growth that was shown by similar students who did not participate in SES in the same schools and districts. In essence, it would be inaccurate to state that SES was the sole reason (or even a contributing factor) for students' mean ISTEP+ growth. The information reported in Tables 6 and 7 does not control for demographics, school or teacher effects, or other programs that students might have participated in. Results are reported for informational purposes only. The matched comparison analysis provided later in this document is a somewhat more rigorous analysis of the effects of SES; however, that analysis, too, has a number of limitations that are detailed in the methodology section.

ISTEP+ Matched Pairs Analysis

Though the results above demonstrate that in some cases, students participating in SES showed a mean growth on ISTEP+ that was the equivalent of one year's worth, analysis of data between the SES group and matched, non-participating students demonstrates that growth shown by SES students was not statistically significantly different than that of their non-SES counterparts (using ANCOVA, $p < .05$). Thus, SES students' growth was not statistically different from growth shown by their non-participating counterparts.

When SES students were compared with similar non-SES students, they tended to do better in Mathematics than in English/Language Arts. This is the same trend that was seen in comparing SES students against themselves on ISTEP+, as well as when looking at performance on pre- and post-assessments. Reasons for this are unclear; however, providers did indicate that they tended to spend more time on Mathematics than English/Language Arts (further evidenced in the fact that more students were served in Mathematics than English/Language Arts). In fact, several providers noted that although they reported each student who had completed 80 percent of their SES sessions as having taken both English/Language Arts and Mathematics lessons (meaning scores would be analyzed for both subjects), the majority of those students reported had spent twice as much time on Mathematics than English/Language Arts.

As noted in the methodology section, results from this analysis should be interpreted with caution, due to several limitations. First, due to the nature of SES (it is based on parent choice), it was not possible to utilize random assignment for the SES and non-SES groups. A quasi-experimental design was used, in which students who participated in SES were matched (on a variety of characteristics described in the methodology section) as closely as possible. However, it was not possible to control for other tutoring, educational activities, supplemental help,

remediation, etc. that both the non-SES and the SES students may have received. Thus, ISTEP+ growth, differences, or lack of differences between SES and non-SES students cannot necessarily be directly or solely attributed to SES participation or even the quality of supplemental services provided. Additionally, it was not feasible (due to lack of data) to match students at the classroom level; instead, students were matched at the school and grade level. Thus, although a student from School X would have been matched with another student from the same grade at School X (and sharing the same demographic characteristics), the two students may not have been in the same classroom with the same teacher. As such, individual teacher-level effects could not be controlled for. Finally, it is important to note that additional factors such as classroom-, school-, and district-level characteristics, reform efforts, instructional activities, etc., also play large role in affecting student achievement.

Mathematics

When looking at performance on ISTEP+ Mathematics, statewide, a greater percentage of those students who participated in SES showed the equivalent of one year's growth than those who did not participate (47 percent of the SES students compared to 43 percent of the non-SES students). The percentages of students showing any scale score growth was about the same for SES students and their matched counterparts (67 percent of the SES students compared to 66 percent of the non-SES students). When holding 2005 ISTEP+ score constant, both groups showed growth in scale score, but growth did not equal the equivalent of one year for either group. While the SES group showed average scale score growth of 18.7 points, which was slightly higher than average scale score growth shown by the non-SES group (16.9 points), growth differences were not statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Descriptive statistics for Mathematics demonstrate that in some districts, larger percentages of SES students showed growth on ISTEP+ than non-SES students, while the results were the opposite in other districts. Overall, a larger percentage of SES students than non-SES students made one year's growth in five of seven districts. ANCOVA was conducted for each district having an n of at least fifteen students in each group (30 overall). While mean growth for both groups in some districts (Gary Community School Corporation, MSD of Lawrence Township, and MSD of Perry Township) was the equivalent of one year, the difference in growth between groups was not statistically significant ($p < .05$). SES students in MSD of Lawrence Township and MSD of Perry Township, on average, showed the most growth (as did the non-SES students in these districts). SES students in MSD of Lawrence Township had the largest growth difference between SES and non-SES students, when holding 2005 ISTEP+ score constant (8.6 points), though differences were not demonstrated to be statistically significantly different. In three districts (East Allen County Schools, Elkhart Community School Corporation, and Gary Community School Corporation), mean growth for non-SES students was greater than that of SES students; however, differences were not statistically significant. In fact, the analysis showed no statistically significant differences in any district ($p < .05$) between 2006 ISTEP+ mean scores for the SES and non-SES groups, when holding 2005 ISTEP+ score constant. Table 8 (Appendix A) provides data for each school district and statewide.

ANCOVA was also conducted by provider (for providers that served multiple districts, districts were aggregated) to determine, when holding ISTEP+ 2005 score constant, if mean growth on 2006 ISTEP+ Mathematics was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ value. Though some providers had SES students show greater mean growth than their non-SES counterparts,

differences were not statistically significant for any providers. As such, the analysis below demonstrates that although for some providers, SES students when compared to themselves showed ISTEP+ mean growth that was the equivalent of one year, the growth that SES students showed did not differ significantly from growth shown by their non-SES matched counterparts.

For nine of twelve providers included in this analysis, SES students showed mean scale score growth on ISTEP+ that was greater than that of their non-SES counterparts. Students from MSD of Lawrence Township Instructional Cadre and Acadamia.Net had the greatest differences (14 points), followed closely by GEO Foundation (13 points). Again, because differences between groups were not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ value, results should be interpreted with caution.

Though ISTEP+ scale score growth was not statistically significant for any providers, for about two-thirds of the providers included in this analysis (8 of 12), a greater percentage of SES students showed the equivalent of one year's growth on ISTEP+ as compared to non-SES students. MSD of Lawrence Township Instructional Cadre (which served MSD of Lawrence Township students) had the highest overall percentage of students showing one year's growth (72 percent), and The Neighborhood Learning Place (which served East Allen County Schools students) had the largest positive difference in percentages of students showing one year's growth (71 percent of SES students compared to 47 percent of matched non-SES students). A to Z In-Home Tutoring (which served 11 districts), the Princeton Review (which served MSD of Perry Township students) and MSD of Lawrence Township Instructional Cadre were the only providers whose students showed the equivalent of one year's growth in both Mathematics and English/Language Arts. However, matched non-SES students for these providers also showed such growth in both subjects, and mean growth differences were not statistically significant at the $p < .05$.

Table 9 (Appendix A) lists ANCOVA results for each provider, as well as the percentage of SES and non-SES students showing any scale score growth and the equivalent of one year's worth of scale score growth on ISTEP+.

English/Language Arts

Comparison results for English/Language Arts, as was the case with Mathematics results, did not demonstrate statistically significant differences between SES and non-SES groups. While a very slightly higher percentage of SES students (47 percent) showed the equivalent of one year's growth on ISTEP+ as compared to non-SES students (46 percent), the difference is virtually negligible. The same percentage of students (67 percent) in each group showed any growth on ISTEP+ scale score. In contrast to Mathematics results, only four of seven districts had a greater percentage of SES students showing one year's growth on ISTEP+ than non-SES students. Marion Community Schools, in which a greater percentage of non-SES students showed one year's growth than SES students in Mathematics, saw the opposite in English/Language Arts. In fact, only Elkhart Community School Corporation had a greater percentage of non-SES students showing one year's growth on ISTEP+ than SES students in both subjects.

When holding 2005 ISTEP+ score constant, both the SES and the matched non-SES group showed growth on scale score, but, as was the case with Mathematics, growth was not equivalent to one year's worth. While mean growth for non-SES students was slightly higher than that of SES students (14.5 points vs. 13.4 points), differences were not statistically significant ($p < .05$).

ANCOVA was conducted for each district having a sample size of at least fifteen students in each group (30 overall). Again, SES students in MSD of Lawrence Township and MSD of Perry Township, on average, showed the most growth (as did the non-SES students in MSD of Lawrence Township). While mean growth for non-SES students was higher than SES students' in only three districts for Mathematics, it was higher in six of seven districts for English/Language Arts. Only SES students in Indianapolis Public Schools had higher mean growth than their non-SES counterparts (4.7 points compared to 1.7 points). Indianapolis Public Schools was also the only district in which SES students outperformed non-SES students across the board (in percentage showing one year's growth, percentage showing any growth, and mean growth on ISTEP+ scale score). However, mean growth differences for SES and non-SES students in Indianapolis Public Schools were not statistically significant ($p < .05$). In fact, as was the case with Mathematics, analysis showed no statistically significant differences between 2006 mean ISTEP+ scores for the SES and non-SES groups in English/Language Arts when holding 2005 ISTEP+ scores constant ($p < .05$). Table 10 (Appendix A) provides data for each school district and statewide.

ANCOVA was also conducted by provider (for providers that served multiple districts, districts were aggregated). Though some providers had SES students show greater mean growth than their non-SES counterparts, differences were not statistically significant for any providers. Thus, similar to the Mathematics analysis, the matched pairs analysis demonstrates that although for some providers, SES students when compared to themselves showed the equivalent of one year's growth, the growth that SES students showed did not differ significantly from growth shown by their non-SES matched counterparts.

In contrast to ISTEP+ Mathematics results, less than half of the SES providers included in this analysis (6 of 13) had their SES students show greater mean scale score growth than non-SES students. While Standards for Excellence had the highest positive difference (8 point growth for SES students versus a three point loss for non-SES students), on average, SES students tended to perform worse than non-SES students in English/Language Arts. Again, because differences between groups were not statistically significant at $p < .05$, results should be interpreted with caution.

Descriptive statistics for each provider show that for slightly over half of the providers included in this analysis (7 of 13), a greater percentage of SES students than non-SES students showed the equivalent of one year's growth on ISTEP+. The percentage of SES students showing one year's growth ranged from a low of 34 percent (Edu-Care Plaza) to a high of 62 percent (MSD of Lawrence Township Instructional Cadre). Standards for Excellence demonstrated the largest positive difference between percentages of SES students showing one year's growth (50 percent) as compared to non-SES students (27 percent).

Table 11 (Appendix A) shows ANCOVA results for each provider, as well as the percentage of SES and non-SES students showing any growth on ISTEP+ and the equivalent of one year's worth of growth.

Future Directions

It is important to note that the above ISTEP+ analyses encompass only one year of SES (2005-2006). As such, it would be useful to continue to analyze providers' patterns of performance over time. In addition, the IDOE plans to collect data on how many students have participated in SES for a number of years, in order to analyze growth patterns over time. It is possible that, while statistically significant differences in growth on ISTEP+ may not occur in just one year, after two or more years receiving SES (especially from the same provider), a student may begin to outperform his or her non-SES counterpart. On the other hand, if providers are demonstrating patterns of non-achievement, they should be removed from the state approved provider list.

For the 2006-2007 evaluation, providers will be evaluated not only on statewide, aggregated results, but also on results disaggregated by district. This will be done because IDOE staff has noticed that in some cases, a provider may do very well in several districts but very poorly in one. Because results are aggregated across districts, the poor results from one district may be masked by positive results in another district. Starting with the 2006-2007 evaluation, providers who perform poorly in one district for two consecutive years will be removed from that district for a period of one year. In addition, IDOE staff will analyze reasons why the provider is performing poorly in that district, will require providers to submit corrective action plans for that district, and will work with the provider and district to improve services.

Additionally, it would be useful to examine the types of providers who are the most successful across all areas of the evaluation (customer satisfaction, service delivery, and academic effectiveness) to determine if patterns exist. Currently, ISTEP+ achievement data do not appear to paint a clear picture as to which providers are the most effective in Indiana. To illustrate, some providers were close to the highest performers (in terms of percentages of students making one year's growth) in one subject and close to the lowest performers in another subject. On the other hand, some providers performed fairly well in both subjects. Further study is needed to determine reasons for both performance discrepancies in subjects, as well as strong performance in both subjects. In addition, although n size was not large enough to include Community Schools of Frankfort, another district provider (in addition to MSD Lawrence Township Instructional Cadre), in the ANCOVA analysis, descriptive data indicates that Community Schools of Frankfort was also a high performing provider on ISTEP+, at least when looking at SES students only. As such, are district providers more likely to be effective at increasing ISTEP+ scores because they are more familiar with academic standards and ISTEP+ content? Further analysis is needed in this area. Of course, the answer to this question may not be as clear-cut as it seems, because a number of providers hire certified teachers from the school districts in which they are working. It seems that these teachers may also be more likely to have increased familiarity with ISTEP+ and Indiana academic standards. Thus, further analysis into the correlation between teacher qualifications, as well as the effects of hiring teachers from the school districts in which a provider operates, is warranted. Also, looking at the correlations between academic effectiveness and length of services, types of services (online, small group, etc.), and levels of student/instructor ratio would be useful. Finally, it appears that in general, students tended to do better in Mathematics than English/Language Arts. Further research into this area may reveal whether this is a pattern or an anomaly. If it is a pattern, it would be useful to identify reasons why students are performing better in one subject than another, and what characteristics of the tutoring programs may be causing these differences. As such, the Indiana

Department of Education plans to conduct such analyses based on results of the 2005-2006 evaluation and results of the 2006-2007 evaluation.

Finally, because a common area of concern among those surveyed was lack of communication between the provider and the district, parents, or principals, the Indiana Department of Education plans to work with all constituents to increase communication. The Department is in the process of producing a Resource Guide for providers that offers tips for increasing communication, as well as strategies for increasing student achievement in English/Language Arts and math.

APPENDIX A

Table 1: Providers by District

DISTRICT NAME	# of Students Served¹	# OF PROVIDERS	PROVIDER NAME(S)
Ft. Wayne Community Schools	14	1	A to Z In-Home Tutoring
East Allen County Schools	164	3	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, Specialty Tutoring, The Neighborhood Learning Place
Community Schools of Frankfort	132	1	Com. Schs. of Frankfort
Muncie Community Schools	31	2	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, Muncie Public Library
Elkhart Community Schools	113	1	PLATO Learning
New Albany-Floyd Co. Con. Sch. Corp.	0	0	N/A
Franklin Cty. Community School Corp.	1 ²	1	Club Z! Tutoring
Marion Community Schools	104	1	Sylvan Learning Center (Marion, IN)
New Castle Community School Corp.	0	0	N/A
Vincennes Community School Corp.	3 (ELA), 4 (Math)	1	Brainfuse
Gary Community School Corp.	877	12	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, ATS Project Success, Acadamia.Net, Career Resource Centers, Catapult Online, Club Z! Tutoring, Edu-Care Plaza, GEO Foundation, Kumon North America, Spectra Services, The Learning Station, Workforce Development
School City of Hammond	34	3	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, Ace It! Tutoring, Pyramids, Inc.
Anderson Community Schools	140	3	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, ATS Project Success, Club Z! Tutoring
MSD of Lawrence Township	190 (ELA), 189 (Math)	6	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, ATS Project Success, Babbage Net School, Gideon's Gate, MSDLT Instructional Cadre, Midwest Life Enhancement Services
MSD of Perry Township	234 (ELA), 230 (Math)	5	ATS Project Success, Club Z! Tutoring, GEO Foundation, IN Learning Systems (Sylvan), The Princeton Review
Indianapolis Public Schools	1,395 (ELA), 1,776 (Math)	14	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, ATS Project Success, AYS, Inc., Acadamia.Net, Boys & Girls Clubs of Indy, Club Z! Tutoring, Edu-Care Plaza, Educational Recovery Clinic, GEO Foundation, Gideon's Gate, IN OIC State Council, Midwest Life Enhancement Services, Standards for Excellence, Tools of Empowerment
Monroe County Community School Corp.	6	1	A to Z In-Home Tutoring
Spencer-Owen Community Schools	0	0	N/A
Portage Township Schools	2 (ELA), 3 (Math)	1	Kumon North America
Scott County School District #1	0	0	N/A
Southwest School Corp.	70	1	A to Z In-Home Tutoring
Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corp.	62	4	A Little Extra Help Tutoring Services, A to Z In-Home Tutoring, Educational Recovery Clinic, Kumon North America
Western Wayne Schools	0	0	N/A

¹ Denotes the number of students who signed up for and were at least contacted by the provider, as reported by the provider.

² As reported by the district.

Table 2: Parent Survey Results

SURVEY QUESTIONS	AVERAGE
Q1: My child improved in school because of the tutoring	3.31
Q2: My child thought the tutoring was a good experience.	3.48
Q3: The lessons were of high quality.	3.45
Q4: My child's progress was reported to me on a regular basis.	3.27
Q5: The tutoring staff was helpful and supportive to my child.	3.47
Q6: Overall, I would rate this tutoring provider as: (excellent, good, average, poor)	3.60

Table 3: District Survey Results

SURVEY QUESTIONS	AVERAGE
Q1: Defined specific achievement goals for students receiving SES.	1.77
Q2: Provided progress reports to the district and/or teachers as set out in the contract.	1.70
Q3: Provided parents with information on the program and the academic achievement progress of their children as set out in the contract.	1.73
Q4: Adhered to the agreed timetable for improving the student's achievement as set out in the contract.	1.55
Q5: Services were consistent with the instruction and content used by the district.	1.89
Q6: Provided services to eligible English language learners and/or eligible students with special education needs, as contracted (as applicable).	1.82
Q7: Followed all confidentiality requirements for the disclosure of student information as set out in the contract.	2.00
Q8: Followed all reasonable administrative requirements as set out by the district for SES provision and as described in the contract.	1.77
Q9: The provider fulfilled all contractual obligations.	1.70

Table 4: Principal Survey Results

SURVEY QUESTIONS	% of "don't know" responses	AVERAGE
Q1: The provider maintained a positive relationship with school staff.	18%	2.51
Q2: Services offered by the provider did not interfere with the regular school day.	13%	3.23
Q3: The provider consistently monitored the progress of students receiving SES.	30%	2.56
Q4: The provider gave teachers of SES students information on their academic progress.	25%	2.14
Q5: Parents of SES students receiving services were pleased with this provider.	42%	2.82
Q6: The provider followed all school and district rules.	26%	2.92
Q7: The students in my school seem to have improved academically as a result of SES.	35%	2.25
Q8: Overall, I would rate this tutoring provider as: (excellent, good, average, poor).	1%	2.22

Table 5: On-site Monitoring and Compliance Results

Ratings	DOCUMENT ANALYSIS					
	Tutor Qualifications ³	Recruiting Materials	Academic Program	Progress Reporting		
	% of satisfactory ratings	91%	100%	97%		88%
	% of unsatisfactory ratings	9%	0%	3%		12%
Ratings	ONSITE VISIT					
	Lesson matches original description	Instruction is clear	Time on task is appropriate	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Student/instructor ratio ⁴	
	% of satisfactory ratings	93%	97%	91%	96%	97%
	% of unsatisfactory ratings	7%	3%	9%	4%	3%
Ratings	COMPLIANCE					
	Criminal background checks	Health/safety laws & regulations	Financial viability			
	% of satisfactory ratings	94%	100%			100%
	% of unsatisfactory ratings	6%	0%			0%

³ In 2005-2006, Indiana had not yet set minimum tutor qualification requirements. However, all providers had lead tutors that had at least Bachelor's degrees. A "satisfactory" rating in the Tutor Qualification section indicated that a provider's tutor qualifications met the description provided in the originally submitted application. "Unsatisfactory" ratings indicated that the qualifications did not meet the description. As of 2007-2008, all tutors must, at a minimum, meet at least Title I para-professional qualifications.

⁴ In 2005-2006, Indiana had not yet set maximums on student/instructor ratios. As such, a provider was given a "satisfactory" rating if their student/instructor ratio met or was less than the ratio described in their originally approved application. An "unsatisfactory" rating indicated that the ratio was higher than initially described. As of 2007-2008, a provider's student/instructor ratio may not exceed 8:1.

Table 6 ISTEP+ Results (SES students only) (English/Language Arts)

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS				
PROVIDER NAME	GRADE LEVEL(S)	% SHOWING ANY GROWTH	% SHOWING EQUIV. OF 1 YEAR'S GROWTH	AVERAGE CHANGE (05 SCALE SCORE - 06 SCALE SCORE)
A to Z In-Home Tutoring	3	80%	53%	20
	4	67%	47%	12
	5	100%	94%	62 *
	Also served grades 6-8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	76%	63%	28 *
Academia.Net	Served grades 3-8; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	69%	44%	20 *
Ace It! Tutoring	Total n < 15			
A Little Extra Help Tutoring Svcs.	Total n < 15			
ATS Project Success	Total n < 15			
Babbage Net School	Total n < 15			
Boys & Girls Clubs (Indy)	Total n < 15			
Career Resource Centers	Total n < 15			
Catapult Online	Total n < 15			
Club Z! Tutoring	3	83%	58%	28*
	4	73%	45%	18*
	5	74%	39%	18
	6	66%	41%	13
	7	64%	42%	12
	8	38%	35%	-16
	TOTAL	60%	41%	7
Com. Schools of Frankfort	Total n < 15			
Edu-Care Plaza	Served grades 3-8; total only reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	70%	37%	15
Educational Recovery Clinic	Also served grades 3-5; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	6	57%	21%	2
	7	75%	65%	23 *
	8	38%	31%	-8
	TOTAL	64%	38%	10
GEO Foundation	Served grades 3-8; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	61%	44%	9
IN Learning Systems (Sylvan)	Total n < 15			
Kumon North America	Total n < 15			
Midwest Life Enhancement Svcs.	Total n < 15			
MSDLT Instructional Cadre	Served grades 3-4; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	5	86%	77%	43 *
	TOTAL	83%	65%	31 *
Muncie Public Library	Total n < 15			
PLATO Learning	Also served grades 3 and 6; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	4	72%	56%	23 *
	5	73%	27%	10
	TOTAL	73%	42%	19
Pyramids, Inc.	Total n < 15			
Specialty Tutoring	Total n < 15			
Spectra Services	Total n < 15			
Standards for Excellence	Also served grades 6 and 8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	7	67%	53%	21 *
	TOTAL	58%	47%	7
Sylvan Learning Center (Marion)	Also served grades 3 and 4; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	5	65%	35%	11
	TOTAL	70%	48%	16

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS (Table 6 Continued)				
PROVIDER NAME	GRADE LEVEL(S)	% SHOWING ANY GROWTH	% SHOWING EQUIV. OF 1 YEAR'S GROWTH	AVERAGE CHANGE (05 SCALE SCORE - 06 SCALE SCORE)
The Learning Station	Total n < 15			
The Neighborhood Learning Place	Served grades 3-5; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	71%	33%	14
The Princeton Review	3	100%	58%	35 *
	4	81%	61%	25 *
	5	87%	74%	38 *
	TOTAL	86%	65%	31 *
Tools of Empowerment	Also served grades 4, 5, & 8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	3	84%	68%	30 *
	6	67%	46%	19
	7	66%	44%	14
	TOTAL	67%	45%	16
INDIANA TOTALS	3	76%	50%	21
	4	72%	49%	18 *
	5	81%	54%	28 *
	6	62%	35%	11
	7	68%	48%	15
	8	40%	37%	-9
	TOTAL	68%	46%	15

**Equivalent to one year's growth (where totals are reported for multiple grades, one year's growth equivalent is an average of one year's growth across grades served). Equivalent of one year's growth is defined in the methodology section of this report.*

Table 7 ISTEP+ Results (SES students only) (Mathematics)

MATHEMATICS				
PROVIDER NAME	GRADE LEVEL(S)	% SHOWING ANY GROWTH	% SHOWING EQUIV. OF 1 YEAR'S GROWTH	AVERAGE CHANGE (05 SCALE SCORE - 06 SCALE SCORE)
A to Z In-Home Tutoring	3	67%	53%	19
	4	67%	60%	16*
	5	100%	88%	74 *
	Also served grades 6-8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	76%	62%	33*
Academia.Net	Served grades 3-8; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	71%	35%	15
Ace It! Tutoring	Not applicable; served students in English/Language Arts only			
A Little Extra Help Tutoring Svcs.	Total n < 15			
ATS Project Success	Total n < 15			
Babbage Net School	Total n < 15			
Boys & Girls Clubs (Indy)	Total n < 15			
Career Resource Centers	Total n < 15			
Catapult Online	Total n < 15			
Club Z! Tutoring	3	67%	58%	13
	4	61%	57%	24*
	5	83%	74%	57*
	6	57%	40%	9
	7	78%	34%	21
	8	53%	34%	7
	TOTAL	65%	38%	18
Com. Schools of Frankfort	Not applicable; served students in English/Language Arts only			

MATHEMATICS (Table 7 Continued)				
PROVIDER NAME	GRADE LEVEL(S)	% SHOWING ANY GROWTH	% SHOWING EQUIV. OF 1 YEAR'S GROWTH	AVERAGE CHANGE (05 SCALE SCORE – 06 SCALE SCORE)
Edu-Care Plaza	Served grades 3-8; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	64%	43%	14
Educational Recovery Clinic	Also served grades 3-5; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	6	56%	42%	5
	7	70%	39%	22 *
	8	47%	27%	-6
	TOTAL	57%	38%	6
GEO Foundation	Served grades 3-8; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	71%	51%	29 *
IN Learning Systems (Sylvan)	Total n < 15			
Kumon North America	Total n < 15			
Midwest Life Enhancement Svcs.	Total n < 15			
MSDLT Instructional Cadre	Served grades 3-4; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	5	95%	73%	57 *
	TOTAL	92%	75%	50 *
Muncie Public Library	Total n < 15			
PLATO Learning	Also served grades 3 and 6; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	4	65%	58%	17
	5	87%	47%	47 *
	TOTAL	63%	44%	18
Pyramids, Inc.	Total n < 15			
Specialty Tutoring	Total n < 15			
Spectra Services	Total n < 15			
Standards for Excellence	Also served grades 6 and 8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	7	80%	60%	41 *
	TOTAL	59%	41%	12
Sylvan Learning Center (Marion)	Also served grades 3 and 4; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	5	88%	29%	30
	TOTAL	72%	28%	13
The Learning Station	Total n < 15			
The Neighborhood Learning Place	Served grades 3-5; only total reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	TOTAL	78%	65%	23
The Princeton Review	3	100%	75%	49 *
	4	81%	65%	23 *
	5	91%	78%	54 *
	TOTAL	88%	71%	38 *
Tools of Empowerment	Also served grades 4, 5, & 8; not reported as n < 15 for each grade			
	3	53%	26%	5
	6	63%	50%	14
	7	74%	35%	26 *
	TOTAL	62%	38%	17
INDIANA TOTALS	3	65%	50%	16
	4	69%	57%	17 *
	5	91%	66%	54 *
	6	54%	39%	4
	7	75%	37%	23
	8	52%	30%	3
	TOTAL	67%	46%	19

**Equivalent to one year's growth (where totals are reported for multiple grades, one year's growth equivalent is an average of one year's growth across grades served). Equivalent of one year's growth is defined in the methodology section of this report.*

Table 8 Matched Comparison Results by District (ISTEP+ Mathematics)

District	Student Group	% of students matched ⁵	% showing equivalent of 1 year's growth	% showing any growth	Covariate value (2005 scale score) ⁶	2006 scale score ⁷	Difference	F value**
Ft. Wayne Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
East Allen Cty. Schools	SES	79%	55%	73%	425.2	440.2	15.0	F _(1,63) = .038
	Non-SES		42%	70%	425.2	442.0	16.8	
Muncie Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Com. Schools of Frankfort	Not applicable (served students in English/Language Arts only)							
Elkhart Com. Sch. Corp.	SES	61%	43%	63%	414.3	431.8	17.5	F _(1,67) = .415
	Non-SES		60%	77%	414.3	437.5	23.2*	
Franklin Cty. Com. Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Marion Com. Schools	SES	59%	22%	65%	441.4	450.6	9.2	F _(1,43) = .381
	Non-SES		30%	57%	441.4	444.7	3.3	
Vincennes Com. Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Gary Com. Sch. Corp.	SES	92%	59%	68%	409.9	435.5	25.6*	F _(1,249) = .031
	Non-SES		55%	69%	409.9	436.8	26.9*	
Sch. City of Hammond	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Anderson Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
MSD of Lawrence Twp.	SES	62%	68%	90%	421.1	463.0	41.9*	F _(1,77) = 1.267
	Non-SES		55%	78%	421.1	454.4	33.3*	
MSD of Perry Twp.	SES	71%	64%	83%	421.1	452.1	31.0*	F _(1,137) = .339
	Non-SES		54%	77%	421.1	448.6	27.5*	
Indianapolis Public Schools	SES	55%	36%	61%	481.1	491.9	10.8	F _(1,699) = .459
	Non-SES		33%	59%	481.1	489.7	8.6	
Monroe Cty. Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Portage Twp. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Southwest Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Evansville-Vanderburgh Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
INDIANA TOTALS	SES	64%	47%	67%	447.8	466.5	18.7	F _(1,1425) = .554
	Non-SES		43%	66%	447.8	464.7	16.9	

*Equivalent of one year's growth

** No F values are significant at the p < .05 level

⁵ Denotes the percentage of total SES students who were able to be matched with a non-SES counterpart on the variables described in the methodology section.

⁶ Value at which 2005 score (as covariate) is evaluated in ANCOVA analysis.

⁷ 2006 scale score is adjusted based on using adjusted 2005 ISTEP+ scale score as covariate, evaluated at values provided in Column 6.

Table 9 Matched Comparison Results by Provider (ISTEP+ Mathematics)

District	Student Group	% of students matched ⁸	% showing equivalent of 1 year's growth	% showing any growth	Covariate value (2005 scale score) ⁹	2006 scale score ¹⁰	Difference	F value**
A to Z In-Home Tutoring	SES	79%	61%	76%	409.7	443.8	34.1*	F _(1,89) = .169
	Non-SES		57%	76%	409.7	439.5	29.8*	
Academia.Net	SES	94%	38%	69%	442.3	457.8	15.5	F _(1,29) = .766
	Non-SES		38%	50%	442.3	444.0	1.7	
A Little Extra Help Tutoring Svcs.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
ATS Project Success	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Babbage Net School	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Boys & Girls Clubs (Indy)	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Career Resource Centers	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Catapult Online	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Club Z! Tutoring	SES	66%	43%	65%	459.1	477.6	18.5	F _(1,335) = .353
	Non-SES		40%	66%	459.1	474.8	15.7	
Edu-Care Plaza	SES	86%	45%	63%	430.3	444.7	14.4	F _(1,73) = .240
	Non-SES		45%	58%	430.3	451.1	20.8	
Educational Recovery Clinic	SES	50%	36%	50%	482.4	481.0	-1.4	F _(1,231) = .210
	Non-SES		32%	50%	482.4	483.8	1.4	
GEO Foundation	SES	86%	57%	80%	432.0	467.4	35.4*	F _(1,57) = 1.094
	Non-SES		53%	63%	432.0	454.2	22.2	
IN Learning Systems (Sylvan)	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Kumon North America	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Midwest Life Enhancmt. Svcs.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
MSDLT Instructional Cadre	SES	60%	72%	93%	422.0	470.8	48.8*	F _(1,55) = 2.089
	Non-SES		66%	76%	422.0	457.1	35.1*	
Muncie Public Library	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Plato Learning	SES	61%	57%	71%	414.3	431.8	17.5	F _(1,67) = .415
	Non-SES		71%	86%	414.3	437.5	23.2*	
Pyramids, Inc.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Specialty Tutoring	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Spectra Services	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Standards for Excellence	SES	65%	46%	67%	490.7	511.8	21.1	F _(1,45) = .214
	Non-SES		25%	58%	490.7	504.3	13.6	
Sylvan Learning Ctr. (Marion)	SES	59%	22%	65%	441.4	450.6	9.2	F _(1,43) = .381
	Non-SES		30%	56%	441.4	444.7	3.3	
The Learning Station	N < 30 (15 per group)							
The Neighborhood Learning Place	SES	74%	71%	82%	427.6	450.2	22.6	F _(1,31) = .014
	Non-SES		47%	65%	427.6	448.5	20.9	
The Princeton Review	SES	62%	63%	83%	424.8	455.4	30.6*	F _(1,79) = .002
	Non-SES		56%	78%	424.8	455.1	30.3*	
Tools of Empowerment	Unable to conduct ANCOVA for this provider							

* Equivalent of one year's growth

** F values were not significant at $p < .05$

⁸ Denotes the percentage of total SES students who were able to be matched with a non-SES counterpart on the variables described in the methodology section.

⁹ Value at which 2005 score (as covariate) is evaluated in ANCOVA analysis.

¹⁰ 2006 scale score is adjusted based on using adjusted 2005 ISTEP+ scale score as covariate, evaluated at values provided in Column 6.

Table 10 Matched Comparison Results by District (ISTEP+ English/Language Arts)

District	Student Group	% of students matched ¹¹	% showing equivalent of 1 year's growth	% showing any growth	Covariate value (2005 scale score) ¹²	2006 scale score ¹³	Difference	F Value**
Ft. Wayne Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
East Allen Cty. Schools	SES	67%	41%	76%	430.1	448.4	18.3	F _(1,55) = .228
	Non-SES		62%	79%	430.1	452.0	21.9	
Muncie Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Com. Schools of Frankfort	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Elkhart Com. Sch. Corp.	SES	60%	47%	70%	399.2	417.7	18.5	F _(1,57) = 1.265
	Non-SES		63%	80%	399.2	425.5	26.3*	
Franklin Cty. Com. Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Marion Com. Schools	SES	60%	50%	79%	431.5	450.2	18.7	F _(1,45) = .949
	Non-SES		46%	83%	431.5	457.6	26.1*	
Vincennes Com. Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Gary Com. Sch. Corp.	SES	85%	48%	69%	438.4	455.9	17.5	F _(1,239) = .061
	Non-SES		47%	70%	438.4	457.1	18.7	
Sch. City of Hammond	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Anderson Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
MSD of Lawrence Twp.	SES	65%	65%	81%	427.3	453.9	26.6*	F _(1,83) = .358
	Non-SES		56%	81%	427.3	457.7	30.4*	
MSD of Perry Twp.	SES	74%	55%	80%	430.9	453.7	22.8*	F _(1,145) = .395
	Non-SES		60%	78%	430.9	456.6	25.7*	
Indianapolis Public Schools	SES	62%	40%	57%	486.3	491.0	4.7	F _(1,589) = 1.181
	Non-SES		35%	53%	486.3	488.0	1.7	
Monroe Cty. Com. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Portage Twp. Schools	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Southwest Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Evansville-Vanderburgh Sch. Corp.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
INDIANA TOTALS	SES	67%	47%	67%	453.7	467.1	13.4	F _(1,1323) = .283
	Non-SES		46%	67%	453.7	468.2	14.5	

*Equivalent of one year's growth

**F values were not significant at $p < .05$

¹¹ Denotes the percentage of total SES students who were able to be matched with a non-SES counterpart on the variables described in the methodology section.

¹² Value at which 2005 score (as covariate) is evaluated in ANCOVA analysis.

¹³ 2006 scale score is adjusted based on using adjusted 2005 ISTEP+ scale score as covariate, evaluated at values provided in Column 6.

Table 11 Matched Comparison Results by Provider (ISTEP+ English/Language Arts)

District	Student Group	% of students matched ¹⁴	% showing equivalent of 1 year's growth	% showing any growth	Covariate value (2005 scale score) ¹⁵	2006 scale score ¹⁶	Difference	F value**
A to Z In-Home Tutoring	SES	66%	59%	74%	427.4	450.0	22.6*	F _(1,75) = .072
	Non-SES		49%	79%	427.4	452.8	25.4*	
Acadamia.Net	SES	94%	47%	73%	460.9	483.7	22.8*	F _(1,27) = .119
	Non-SES		40%	60%	460.9	478.7	17.7	
A Little Extra Help Tutoring Svcs.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
ATS Project Success	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Ace It! Tutoring	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Babbage Net School	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Boys & Girls Clubs (Indy)	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Career Resource Centers	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Catapult Online	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Com. Schools of Frankfort	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Club Z! Tutoring	SES	73%	41%	61%	472.4	478.4	6.0	F _(1,373) = .001
	Non-SES		40%	55%	472.4	478.2	5.8	
Edu-Care Plaza	SES	88%	34%	68%	456.1	468.7	12.6	F _(1,73) = .231
	Non-SES		37%	63%	456.1	465.1	9.0	
Educational Recovery Clinic	SES	33%	54%	35%	479.3	479.0	-0.3	F _(1,49) = .109
	Non-SES		54%	42%	479.3	482.0	2.7	
GEO Foundation	SES	89%	50%	59%	464.2	474.2	10.0	F _(1,61) = .206
	Non-SES		31%	56%	464.2	470.1	5.9	
IN Learning Systems (Sylvan)	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Kumon North America	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Midwest Life Enhancmt. Svcs.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
MSDLT Instructional Cadre	SES	60%	62%	83%	426.8	453.9	27.1*	F _(1,55) = .453
	Non-SES		62%	90%	426.8	458.7	31.9*	
Muncie Public Library	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Plato Learning	SES	63%	47%	70%	399.2	417.7	18.5	F _(1,57) = 1.265
	Non-SES		63%	80%	399.2	425.5	26.3*	
Pyramids, Inc.	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Specialty Tutoring	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Spectra Services	N < 30 (15 per group)							
Standards for Excellence	SES	72%	50%	58%	489.8	498.1	8.3	F _(1,49) = 1.712
	Non-SES		27%	46%	489.8	486.6	-3.2	
Sylvan Learning Ctr. (Marion)	SES	60%	50%	79%	431.5	450.2	18.7	F _(1,45) = .949
	Non-SES		46%	83%	431.5	457.6	26.1*	
The Learning Station	N < 30 (15 per group)							
The Neighborhood Learning Place	SES	63%	40%	80%	423.4	447.1	23.7*	F _(1,27) = .253
	Non-SES		67%	93%	423.4	450.8	24.7*	
The Princeton Review	SES	62%	54%	83%	438.0	460.8	22.8*	F _(1,83) = .945
	Non-SES		56%	83%	438.0	466.7	28.7*	
Tools of Empowerment	SES	43%	40%	60%	481.1	492.3	11.2	F _(1,113) = .865
	Non-SES		36%	62%	481.1	486.4	5.3	

* Equivalent of one year's growth

** F values were not significant at p < .05

¹⁴ Denotes the percentage of total SES students who were able to be matched with a non-SES counterpart on the variables described in the methodology section.

¹⁵ Value at which 2005 score (as covariate) is evaluated in ANCOVA analysis.

¹⁶ 2006 scale score is adjusted based on using adjusted 2005 ISTEP+ scale score as covariate, evaluated at values provided in Column 6.